

Page 2 HEARING RE #53946: Motion for Sanctions filed by James N. Lawlor on behalf of Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc HEARING RE #53970: Letter to Judge Chapman, In re: Sanctions Filed by Stephen R. Williams Transcribed by: Theresa Pullan

Page 3 APPEARANCES: WOLLMUTH MAHER & DEUTSCH LLP Attorneys for Lehman Brothers 500 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10110 BY: JOHN G. GIAMPOLO, ESQ. VIA TELEPHONE STEPHEN WILLIAMS -- Mortgage Experts LOUIS COHAN, ESQ. -- Home Lenders of Georgia

	19 4 01 21			
	Page 4			
1	PROCEEDINGS			
2	THE COURT: Is everyone here?			
3	MR. GIAMPOLO: John Giampolo, Wollmuth Maher &			
4	Deutsch on behalf of the movant, Lehman Brothers Holdings, Inc.			
5	as plan administrator.			
6	THE COURT: Very good. All right. Let me see who I			
7	have on the phone. Mr. Williams, are you there?			
8	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, Your Honor.			
9	THE COURT: Thank you. All right. Why don't you go			
10	ahead?			
11	MR. GIAMPOLO: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor,			
12	the matters before you I filed a notice of agenda.			
13	THE COURT: Yes.			
14	MR. GIAMPOLO: Would you like an additional copy?			
15	THE COURT: Yes. This is Lehman's motion with			
16	respect to the ADR procedures order that we previously entered			
17	a number of months ago, and it relates to the noncompliance			
18	with the order by parties who are listed on exhibit C to the			
19	motion. Correct?			
20	MR. GIAMPOLO: Exhibit C and Exhibit D.			
21	THE COURT: Okay.			
22	MR. GIAMPOLO: Altogether there are 36 counterparties			
23	that are subject to the motion.			
24	THE COURT: Right.			
25	MR. GIAMPOLO: Since we filed the motion, Your Honor,			

Page 5 ten of those counterparties have essentially agreed to start 1 2 complying, essentially have started to comply and so we've 3 adjourned the motion as to those ten. I filed a motion to 4 adjourn. 5 THE COURT: Okay. And those are the parties who 6 filed something that was styled as nonresponsive or 7 nonobjection. 8 MR. GIAMPOLO: A few of them did, Your Honor, file 9 that. Altogether there's ten parties, counterparties, the 36 10 that the motion was adjourned as to and they're listed in the 11 notice of adjournment that was filed. So what's before Your 12 Honor today is the motion as to the remaining 26. 13 THE COURT: Okay. MR. GIAMPOLO: And what's also before Your Honor is 14 15 out of the 26 counterparties that the motion is proceeding 16 against today, only one of them filed an actual response or 17 objection to the motion. THE COURT: And that's Mr. Williams. 18 19 MR. GIAMPOLO: Which is -- actually, that's Home Lenders of Georgia. 20 21 THE COURT: Yes. 22 MR. GIAMPOLO: Filed their response, or objection to 23 the motion. Mr. Williams on behalf of Mortgage Experts had filed 24 25 with the Court a letter, actually prior to this motion had

filed a letter raising issues that completely overlap with this motion, so I understand the Court had asked that Mr. Williams' letter be heard in connection with this motion.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So why don't you proceed first with respect to all of the other parties other than Mr. Williams? Let's do that first and then I'll hear from Mr. Williams and also have you clarify the state of the issues that Mr. Williams raises.

MR. GIAMPOLO: Okay. And before I do that, Your Honor, just an additional point is, in connection with the motion before Your Honor, we also filed the motion to seal because a number of the exhibits were filed as redacted.

THE COURT: So I'll grant that motion.

MR. GIAMPOLO: Thank you, Your Honor.

As Your Honor knows, this motion arises from, I'll refer to it as the sanctions motion. This motion arises from the ADR order that Your Honor entered back on July 18th, 2014. We have, we've got a number of counterparties that had over time, over several months, if not a year or two years, have failed or refused to comply with the alternative dispute resolution, the mediation process.

So even after they were repeatedly warned, even after they were given warning letters which are also attached as additional exhibits to this motion, they still have failed or refuse to comply so we had no choice really but to bring this

motion.

THE COURT: And they simply haven't responded. Or have they responded and said, we're not going to comply?

MR. GIAMPOLO: All of the counterparties listed on exhibit C have not provided a response to the ADR notice, at least some of them have communicated and said that, I believe that they will not comply or they don't believe that they have to.

All the parties, there's about seven of them, the counterparties listed on exhibit D, as I've noted in the commentaries, which are included on exhibit D, those parties, those seven counterparties have answered the ADR notices, but then failed or refuse to continue to mediation.

A number of them have continued to correspond with us, particularly Home Lenders of Georgia. Its counsel has continued to correspond with us and did provide a response or answer to its ADR notice, but it has simply repeatedly refused to actually proceed to mediation.

And for that particular counterparty, as set forth in my reply papers, Home Lenders of Georgia, actually had submitted a letter back in January of this year to Your Honor basically asking to be excused from compliance with the ADR order. There was a telephonic conference on April 29th of this year during which Your Honor basically told Home Lenders of Georgia, told its counsel that they are subject to the order,

Pg 8 of 27 Page 8 1 and they do need to proceed to mediation. 2 THE COURT: Right. 3 MR. GIAMPOLO: As set forth in the motion and my 4 reply papers, Home Lenders of Georgia, its counsel then continued to refuse to proceed with mediation in accordance 5 with the ADR order. 6 7 At first, they communicated that it wanted Lehman to 8 pay its fees in connection with the mediation, which is not what the order requires. The order requires sharing fees so it 9 10 doesn't cost the estate. It also asks or basically told us 11 that it would only appear by video conference, which the order 12 does not require, but out of good faith, Lehman agreed to do 13 that. And in response we were told repeatedly as set forth in 14 my reply papers, that Home Lenders of Georgia, its client, would only show up for mediation to just say no, would not, 15 16 obviously would not show up in good faith by that statement, 17 would not listen to the mediator, would not listen to what had 18 to be said and participate in good faith in a mediation or 19 settlement conference. 20 Now, that's Home Lenders of Georgia that I'm giving 21 you so much detail on, because they're the one that --22 THE COURT: I understand. 23 MR. GIAMPOLO: -- provided the objection. The other parties, that are counterparties that are 24

included in exhibit D, they each have commentaries.

	Page 9
1	THE COURT: So this is, looks like Ms. Berman filed a
2	response.
3	MR. GIAMPOLO: Correct. It was Ms. Berman that filed
4	it. It was Mr. Louis Cohan who had been corresponding.
5	THE COURT: Yes.
6	MR. GIAMPOLO: And who also appeared by pro hac
7	papers recently.
8	THE COURT: Okay. But neither of them Mr. Cohan,
9	you're on the phone?
10	MR. COHAN: Yeah, Judge. I was not admitted to the
11	Court. Ms. Berman was, so she was kind to help me get the
12	response filed Monday after Thanksgiving.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Well
14	MR. COHAN: Since then, I'm admitted and I'm here.
15	THE COURT: So Mr. Berman [sic], your position is
16	that you'll show up at the mediation to just say no?
17	MR. COHAN: I'm Louis Cohan.
18	THE COURT: Yes.
19	MR. COHAN: Judge, not in bad faith. We have
20	explained in very detailed fashion in response to the
21	contentions why there was no merit. And what we have
22	THE COURT: Mr. Cohan, I have to tell you that
23	virtually every party, many many parties take the positon, have
24	taken the position, will take the position that there's no
25	merit to a claim being asserted against them. And certainly

that's true with respect to a large number of the mortgage sellers who are involved in this proceeding.

The purpose of the ADR order is to set up a framework in which the parties in good faith can have a discussion. It's not appropriate for you to once again try to convince me that your position is meritorious and that Lehman's is not. The purpose of the ADR order is for you to attend the mediation, and as I understand it, Lehman has made a concession to allow that to take place by videoconference, and for you to have that discussion with the mediator. That's different from just saying no. Because --

MR. COHAN: Judge, just want you to know -- sorry to interrupt. We had that telephone conference with you, we fully intended to comply with your direction. We exchanged correspondence with Lehman Brothers. The last correspondence was my letter to Lehman Brothers saying that we would participate in a video deposition, I'm sorry, mediation. I did indicate that I thought that our position would be no, we don't think we owe any money, but that's not to say that we would show up in bad faith. You know, my client and I would have been there. We did ask that they pay the fees. We never heard back from them.

I also explained, and this is really why we're here today, that I'm convinced my client is not one of the sellers identified in the motion or the order. I don't think it

pertains to my client at all. We never heard back from Lehman at all until out of the blue we got this motion, I think it was filed on November 18th, right before Thanksgiving.

So we have, as Mr. Giampolo indicated to the Court, continued to correspond and be communicative. We responded to every communication from Lehman Brothers. We've explained, contrary to what the motion represents to the Court, we have explained in detail our position and why, and I really am convinced that the order does not apply to my client because Lehman Brothers never purchased any mortgage from my client. And I'd like to go through that in a little bit of detail when the Court is ready to hear me on that.

THE COURT: Mr. Cohan, the time to do that is at the mediation where all of the time that you're spending having this conversation now here today or otherwise with Lehman can simply be had in the video mediation.

And to the extent that you believe that the events, the chain leading to these loans being acquired by Lehman means that you're not a seller as defined by the ADR motion, you can, Lehman will explain to you again why they believe that you're covered and you can explain to Lehman why you believe that you're not. But that will then have constituted the mediation. So instead of continuing to talk about having it or not, simply have it. And then Lehman will make a determination as to what to do next.

It may be that after that conversation, you see things in a new light, it may be that you don't. But that's what a good faith mediation is. Lehman may walk away from that mediation and decide it's not going to pursue claims against Home Lenders of Georgia or Lehman may decide that it is. And at that point, you know, Home Lenders of Georgia will have a decision to make in terms of whether or not it wants to make a settlement offer, engage in settlement discussions -- that's the way it proceeds.

So I'm not going to have a hearing on the merits right now of whether or not, on your arguments as to why Home Lenders of Georgia has or does not have liability. There are many others that are in your situation who have recognized the need to participate. So all of this time and energy could just be spent getting on the video, having the conversation, and then we move on.

MR. COHAN: Judge, thank you. And obviously, we're going to abide by the Court's direction on that. I beg the Court not to hold my client in any kind of contempt or impose any sanctions. But could I get a little direction?

First, again, I'd l like to, irrespective of the merits of the three things, we just don't think this order, the ADR order, was ever intended to apply to our client. But if you're telling my client that it should mediate, then it's going to mediate.

THE COURT: I appreciate that. I can tell you that many counterparties have taken the position that it doesn't apply. On the record that I have before me, I believe that it applies. If I were to engage in a contested hearing with every party who says that one thing or another doesn't apply to them, we would never get anything done.

So what I'm suggesting to you is that I will not hold your client in contempt, I will not impose any sanctions, on the understanding that the discussion that you would like to have right now will be part of the discussion that you'll have in the mediation, and Lehman -- and I'm looking at the folks who are here representing Lehman -- will move on from there, that they won't be coming back to tell me that they again want to seek sanctions in connection with the order.

I don't have the authority, of course, to order anybody to settle. All I can do is enter an order that requires parties to mediate in good faith. If you're indicating to me that you're willing to do that, particularly with the video conference concession that Lehman has made which I appreciate so that everybody can save costs and don't have to travel, then we should just move forward. And it's not going to be a half a day, it sounds like it's going to be a relatively short session.

MR. COHAN: Thank you, Judge. And the only other thing is just in terms of the cost of that. My client, and

representing to the Court, in a good month, maybe they have a thousand dollars of disposable income, that means like over and above groceries and bills. And if it's a short mediation, I'd ask that Lehman pay for it. I don't know how much the mediator is going to cost, I don't know what the hourly rate is, it's New York, I assume it's expensive. So I just ask that we do this as efficiently as possible and whatever you decide, we'll abide by.

MR. GIAMPOLO: Your Honor, the ADR order very clearly provides for sharing of costs, not for the estate to incur the full costs.

And, Your Honor, to your point that so many counterparties have tried to say that the order doesn't apply to them, the same number of counterparties have said that they don't have any money. And if we listen to that, then there would be no ADR process and we would resolve nothing.

THE COURT: I understand. One of the things, Mr.

Cohan, that I would like you to do is be prepared when you have the mediation session to present evidence with respect to your client's lack of wherewithal because that's something that will go, that I would imagine may go into Lehman's analysis of whether or not to pursue claims against your client.

So the cost is going to be incurred, why don't we leave for another day reconsideration of the issue of whether or not there's going to be a 50/50 split on the mediation fee

or whether the estate will shoulder the entire expense.

As a matter of fairness to all the other claimants, I'm not prepared to say right now that there are sufficient special circumstances that warrant variation from the general rule as expressed in the order and other mediation, ADR orders that requires sharing of the expenses. So I'd like to table that for today and put it off for another day.

MR. GIAMPOLO: Your Honor, if that's how you'd like to proceed with this one individual counterparty, as long as Lehman has reserved its rights to seek its half of the costs --

THE COURT: Absolutely.

MR. GIAMPOLO: -- because I think Your Honor can appreciate setting a dangerous example for every counterparty going forward to say I don't have money so I can't pay the costs.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. GIAMPOLO: Just like, I don't have money, therefore, I shouldn't be forced to mediate.

THE COURT: All right. So we've taken a lot of time to get to where I think we need to be which is Mr. Cohan, that Home Lenders of Georgia is going to participate in a video mediation session with the question of any departure with respect to the cost of that to be determined at a later date.

MR. GIAMPOLO: One additional point, Your Honor, if I may, ig the proposed order that is included with our sanctions

motion is structured in such a way that as long as a counterparty complies right away within a reasonable time, then the counterparty is not going to face liability for sanctions. If we're going to deviate from the proposed order for Home Lenders of Georgia, then I would at least ask that Your Honor also impose at least a 30-day deadline for Home Lenders of Georgia to have -- we'll make sure a mediator gives Home Lenders of Georgia a couple of dates -- but they need to have a deadline.

THE COURT: All right. Let's have Home Lenders of Georgia be in a separate order that will recite this and I'll so order the record as well. And Mr. Cohan, I am going to grant Lehman's request to implement, to include a 30-day deadline.

MR. COHAN: We can mediate as soon as tomorrow or next week or whatever.

THE COURT: Okay. I mean no one needs to ruin their Christmas holidays, but let's call it 30 days from the date of entry of the order. All right?

MR. GIAMPOLO: I'm sorry, Your Honor, one last point for Home Lenders of Georgia, and this is also going to apply to Mortgage Experts, is that documents that were filed as exhibits by Home Lenders of Georgia, as well Mortgage Experts, included confidential documents that are protected by the ADR order, since they violated the order again, and part of our motion

Page 17 1 papers have asked that those documents are to be removed from 2 the record or redacted. 3 THE COURT: With respect to Mortgage Experts, we 4 removed those from public view. I was not aware of that issue 5 with respect to Home Lenders of Georgia. 6 MR. GIAMPOLO: It's in my reply papers, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry. 8 MR. GIAMPOLO: There are two documents that are 9 specifically flagged. 10 THE COURT: I missed it. Okay. So we'll take care 11 of that by blocking those documents from view on the docket. 12 MR. GIAMPOLO: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 MR. COHAN: We join that motion, we're happy to do 14 that. Thank you. 15 THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Cohan. So I think that takes 16 care of everything with respect to Home Lenders of Georgia. 17 MR. COHAN: Thank you. Have a good day. THE COURT: Yes sir, have a good day. 18 19 With respect to the other parties then, we've 20 received no other responses. Correct? 21 MR. GIAMPOLO: We've received no other responses, 22 just the Mortgage Experts filed the letter before the motion. 23 THE COURT: Okay. So other than Mortgage Experts, is 24 there anyone in the courtroom or on the phone who wishes to be 25 heard with respect to Lehman's sanctions motion?

Page 18 1 All right. So the relief is granted with respect to 2 all of those other parties. 3 MR. GIAMPOLO: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: All right. So let's -- Mr. Williams? Mr. Williams, are you there? 5 6 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, ma'am. 7 THE COURT: First of all, I need to point out that as 8 I understand it, you're not an attorney. Correct? 9 MR. WILLIAMS: That is correct. 10 THE COURT: Okay. And you're not representing 11 yourself. Correct? 12 MR. WILLIAMS: Correct. 13 THE COURT: Okay. That's not permitted. An 14 individual is entitled to represent himself or herself, but a 15 non-lawyer is not permitted to represent a corporate entity in 16 a proceeding like this. 17 So we've engaged in, we've filed your correspondence 18 on the docket, I understand that you have had numerous conversations with my chambers. We're trying our best to 19 20 assist you, but I do need to point out that it's problematic 21 from our perspective to be talking to a non-lawyer representing 22 "a corporate entity." So that's point number one. 23 Point number two is that as I understand what you filed, you're willing to engage in the mediation, or Mortgage 24 25 Experts is willing to engage in the mediation, but that you're

seeking as a precondition the production of certain documents relating to the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac settlements. And there seems to be a misunderstanding on your part on a number of levels -- one, that those documents somehow are no longer going to be available to Lehman or to others after January 1, 2017. And that's just incorrect. That's not a correct reading of the agreement.

Secondly, whether or not documents of that, those documents or any --

MR. WILLIAMS: [indiscernible]

THE COURT: I'm sorry, let me finish, sir. Whether or not those documents or any other documents are available in the context of litigation, is another issue. And that it's not appropriate for there to be a condition in terms of those documents are anything else layered onto the ADR order. So even though you might think, and I don't know one way or the other if it's true, that those documents that you're seeking would demonstrate in your mind that you have no liability, you still have to come to the mediation, Mortgage Experts still has to participate in the mediation. And then if the matter goes to litigation, then you would be entitled at least to request discovery of documents that were relevant to the defense of the claim.

So I'm just going to ask Lehman's counsel, who is standing here in the courtroom, to say what he would like and

Pg 20 of 27 Page 20 1 then I'm happy to hear you. All right? So hold on one second. 2 Go ahead. 3 MR. GIAMPOLO: Your Honor, with respect to Mortgage 4 Experts, what we would like is exactly the same relief we've asked for with respect to the other counterparties subject to 5 the motion, that it simply attends and participates in the 6 7 mediation. 8 THE COURT: And do you disagree with anything that I've said with respect to the Fannie and Freddie documents? 9 10

MR. GIAMPOLO: No, we do not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So Mr. Williams, go ahead.

MR. WILLIAMS: Do you have my December 2nd, 2016

letter? 13

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Yes, I do.

MR. WILLIAMS: Regarding your comments about the availability of these documents with Fannie Mae, their agreement, which I attached as part of my request for sanctions, states that after January 1, 2017, that they would be under no obligation to provide any disclosures or documents to Lehman Brothers. And they have 11,000 loans and I find nothing anywhere in that document that says after January 1, 2017 you can request whatever you want and we will continue to do best efforts to provide that to you.

THE COURT: Well I would suggest to you that if I enter an order requiring Fannie and Freddie to produce those

documents, they're going to produce those documents.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, some of these loans were over 11 years ago, and most places, you know, they're not required to retain documents so long. If you can, if that's your understanding of that, then I would feel more comfortable that they would be able to do that. But I'm not a party to a Fannie Mae Lehman Brothers agreement. So I doubt that they would listen to me.

And if litigation occurs, I think it occurs outside of your Court and I don't know that a new judge would be able to place an order to Fannie Mae which, if they did set that precedent then there's 11,000 other documents that would be exposed to having to be produced.

In your order it says that, you know, the parties, both Lehman Brothers and the counterparties are to take a [indiscernible] to take steps to preserve all documents and other evidentiary materials related to the indemnification of the ADR dispute.

THE COURT: Mr. Williams, we're getting, we're really, we're getting very far afield here. So --

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, the documents --

THE COURT: Sir, sir, sir, look. I made an accommodation on many levels right now. You're participating by phone and I'm having a conversation with you, and you're not an attorney. So first of all, there is a basis for there being

litigation before me, and there's a lot of litigation relating to the sellers pending before me. That's point number one.

Point number two is that the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac settlements were approved by me and I retain jurisdiction to enforce my order. So that's point number two.

Point number three is that I entered an ADR order and you are not entitled to unilaterally impose conditions that you believe are applicable to whether or not you comply with the ADR order.

Point number four is that Lehman, acting as a fiduciary for the creditors of the estate is in charge of figuring out whether or not it needs to get documents from Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. And if in fact it needs those documents to prove a case against you or anybody else, then those chips are going to fall where they may.

But most importantly we are only talking about your complying with the ADR order which you have said you are willing to do. You've imposed the condition, and what I'm telling you is that that's inappropriate. And Mortgage Experts needs to comply with the ADR order, and in good faith participate in a mediation session. That's kind of it.

MR. WILLIAMS: Ma'am?

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. WILLIAMS: We had, I do have some personal issues regarding my wife's care. She has myeloma and I'm her sole

caregiver. I've offered in the past to do a video conference and Lehman Brothers only offered to do that if I paid for the entire expense of the mediation. Listening to what happened with the last case, it seems like it's reasonable to do a video conference and have it shared as per your ADR order. Is that reasonable?

THE COURT: All right. So based on Mr. Williams's representations regarding his personal circumstances, is Lehman willing to have Mr. Williams's Mortgage Experts participate in a video mediation?

MR. GIAMPOLO: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So we'll do that. And with respect to the costs, we'll do the same thing on a one off basis not setting a precedent for others, based on your representations as to your difficult personal circumstances, that the mediation will be conducted and the issue of the cost will be revisited at a later time.

MR. GIAMPOLO: And, Your Honor, we also ask that a 30 days' deadline be imposed like Home Lenders.

THE COURT: And that a 30-day deadline be imposed from the entry of the order.

MR. WILLIAMS: I don't know if we need to readdress if the mediation is split 50/50, I'm not asking for any concession on that, I'm just asking to follow the ADR order the way it was.

THE COURT: I misunderstood. All right. Thank you. All right. So hopefully that addresses your issue. And you filed a lot of papers, I understand that unintentionally some of them were filed on the docket with personally identifiable information. We took those off the docket. But filing those papers is a good start and enables Lehman to see what it is that you think constitutes a defense to their claims so that once you have the mediation, everybody can decide what to do from that point forward. MR. GIAMPOLO: Your Honor, if I may. I believe in our reply, in our letter that was submitted in reply to Mr. Williams's letter, I pled that it's not just personal identifiers that were included in what Mr. Williams's filed, but there's also documents and information that are confidential under the ADR order. THE COURT: We took everything off the docket. MR. GIAMPOLO: Okay, just making sure. THE COURT: Yes, we took everything off the docket. Mr. Williams was acting at the suggestion of my chambers. When somebody is sending us letters, we then tell them to put them on the docket and there was just a miscommunication. MR. GIAMPOLO: I understand. THE COURT: All right. So Mr. Williams, counsel is going to prepare an order reflecting the go forward plan with respect to Mortgage Experts. I'm going to so order this record

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Py 25 01 21
	Page 25
1	in that regard, and I think that's everything we have. All
2	right?
3	MR. GIAMPOLO: Yes, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Have a good day, folks.
5	MR. WILLIAMS: Can I ask one question?
6	THE COURT: Can you?
7	MR. WILLIAMS: Can I ask one question?
8	THE COURT: Sure.
9	MR. WILLIAMS: When Lehman Brothers filed, you know,
10	corresponding documents in our files instead of [indiscernible]
11	documents in our file, it would appear that it was a direct
12	never mind, we'll do this at the mediation. Forgive me. Thank
13	you, Your Honor, I appreciate your help. The order will call
14	for 50/50 on the video conference expenses?
15	THE COURT: Yes.
16	MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. I hope you have a good
17	day.
18	THE COURT: Okay, thank you sir.
19	MR. GIAMPOLO: Thank you, Your Honor.
20	(Proceedings concluded at 12:10 PM)
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Fy 20 01 21	
		Page 26
1	INDEX	
2		
3		
4	RULINGS	
5	DESCRIPTION	
6		PAGE
7	HEARING RE #53946: Motion for Sanctions	25
8		
9	HEARING RE #53970: Letter to Judge Chapman	
10	regarding Sanctions	25
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Page 27 1 CERTIFICATION 2 I, Theresa Pullan, certify that the foregoing is a 3 correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording 4 of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Digitally signed by Theresa Pullan Theresa Pullan DN: cn=Theresa Pullan, o=Veritext, ou, email=digital@veritext.com, c=US Date: 2017.05.30 14:06:56 -04'00' 5 6 AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET**00650 7 Theresa Pullan 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 Veritext 23 330 Old Country Road 24 Suite 300 25 Mineola, NY 11501